

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 3, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,708 to Devine et al. (Devine).

In this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 5, 7-10, 12-18, 22, 24-27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 39, and 41-44, and cancel claims 4, 21, 38. Currently claims 1-3, 5-20, 22-37, 39-45 are pending.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner considering the references in the Information Disclosures Statements (IDSs). Applicants note, however, that not all the references listed on the form PTO-1449 from the IDS filed January 2, 2002, have markings indicating that they were considered. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider all the references listed on the form PTO-1449 filed January 2, 2002. Also, Applicants did not receive a copy of the form PTO-1449 attached to the IDS filed on January 8, 2004. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider the references on the form PTO-1449 filed January 8, 2004. For the convenience of the Examiner, Applicants include a copy of these two IDSs, including the PTO forms-1449, and copies of the post cards indicating receipt of copies of all of the listed references in the Patent Office. If the Examiner is missing copies of any of the references submitted by the Applicants in this case, please notify the undersigned so that arrangements can be made to provide additional copies of any references to the Examiner for review.

Amended claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, among other things:

determining if the first and second process belong to a channel; and

accepting the transmitted packet when the first and second process belong to the channel.

Devine discloses a secure server architecture for web based data management including client sessions. See Abstract and col. 20, lines 53-63. It appears as though the Examiner equates a “channel” as recited in claim 1 to “client session” as taught in Devine. A client session, however, is not a “channel” as recited in claim 1. Examples of channels in one embodiment are shown in the specification in Fig. 4 and described on pages 9-11. Devine does not disclose determining if the first and second process belong to a channel and accepting the transmitted packet when the first and second process belong to the channel, as recited in claim 1.

In order to anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose each and every element of a claim. Because Devine does not disclose each and every element of claim 1, it cannot anticipate the claim. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under § 102(e).

Although claims 18 and 35 are of different scope than claim 1 and each other, they each contain some similar terminology. For example, claim 18 recites a combination of elements including, among other things, “means for determining if the first and second process belong to a channel; and means for accepting the transmitted packet when the first and second process belong to the channel.” Further, claim 35 recites a combination of elements including, among other things, “a determining module for determining if the first and second process belong to a channel; and an accepting module for accepting the transmitted packet when the first and second process belong to the channel.” Therefore, Devine also does not anticipate claim 18 or 35 for at least

the same reasons it does not anticipate claim 1 above. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 18 and 35 under § 102(e).

Claim 12 recites a combination of elements including, among other things:

sending a request from the node to a server to verify a username and a node identification associated with a process;
in response to the request, receiving security context information at the node from the server, the security context information comprising a virtual address for the node

As the Examiner indicates, Devine mentions “virtual IP address” at col. 23, line 61. This mention, however, is very brief. Nowhere does Devine disclose receiving security context information at the node from the server in response to the request, where the security context information comprises a virtual address for the node, as recited in claim 12. In other words, although Devine mentions “virtual IP address,” it does not disclose much detail and does not disclose what is recited in claim 12.

Because Devine does not disclose all the elements of claim 12, it cannot anticipate the claim. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 12 under § 102(e).

Although claim 29 is of different scope than claim 12, it contains some similar terminology. For example, claim 29 recites a combination of elements including, among other things “a transmission module that transmits a request to the server to verify a user name and a node identification, and receives security context information from the server in response to the request, wherein the security context information comprises a virtual address for the sender node.” Thus, Devine does not anticipate claim 29 for at

least the same reasons Devine does not anticipate claim 12. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 12 under § 102(e).

Claim 16 recites a combination of elements including, among other things:

obtaining a node identification and a virtual address;
including the node identification and the virtual address in a field corresponding to the first process in a process table;
transmitting a datagram that contains the node identification and the virtual address from the first process to a socket

As mentioned above, Devine mentions a “virtual IP address.” Devine, however, does not disclose “transmitting a datagram that contains the node identification and the virtual address from the first process to a socket,” as recited in claim 16. Because Devine does not disclose all the elements of claim 16, it cannot anticipate the claim. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 16 under § 102(e).

Although claim 33 is of different scope than claim 16, it contains some similar terminology. For example, claim 33 recites a combination of elements including, among other things “means for transmitting a datagram that contains the node identification and virtual address from the first process to a socket.” Thus, Devine does not anticipate claim 33 for at least the same reasons Devine does not anticipate claim 16. Applicants respectfully request that the examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 16 under § 102(e).

Claims 2, 3, 5-12, 17, 19, 20, 22-28, 30-32, 34, 36, 37, and 39-45 all depend on one of independent claims 1, 12, 16, 18, 29, 33, or 35, and include all the limitations of

their respective base claims. Thus, dependent claims 2, 3, 5-12, 17, 19, 20, 22-28, 30-32, 34, 36, 37, and 39-45 are patentable over Devine for at least the same reasons stated above in connection with the respective independent claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2, 3, 5-12, 17, 19, 20, 22-28, 30-32, 34, 36, 37, and 39-45 under § 102(e).

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 30, 2004

By: Kenneth M. Lesch
Kenneth M. Lesch
Reg. No. 44,868

Attachments: **IDS filed January 2, 2002, including two references, Form PTO-1449, and a stamped return post card; and**

IDS filed January 8, 2004, including all references, Form PTO-1449, and a stamped return post card.